

STAT

Page Denied

STAT

REVUE OF ROMANIAN WORKERS PARTY JOURNAL, MAY AND JUNE 1973

May Issue

Editorial

The 15th anniversary of the foundation of the Communist Party of Romania, on 6 May 1921, provides *Lupta de Clasa* with the opportunity for an editorial restatement (pages 3-15) of the history of the regime in the light of the theses adopted by the 20th Congress of the CPSU, ending, rather illogically, with an invitation to historians to "liquidate the weaknesses in the study of party history," many important phases of which "have been insufficiently studied" so far.

The editorial begins with a short account of the early days of the party, which was outlined after only 3 years of "semilegal" existence. It goes on to claim that together with the Social Democratic Party, with which the Communists had formed a united front, and with the collaboration of other parties, the Communist Party had organized the "armed insurrection of 23 August 1944." For this action, the editorial states, the party had taken advantage of the favorable conditions created by the victories of the Red Army and its liberating offensive on Romanian soil, and of the fact that "the revolutionary movement developed directly from the struggle of the entire nation to cast off the fascist yoke."

According to the editorial, the leadership of the masses by the Communist Party was fully consolidated in the course of the revolutionary struggle for the seizure of power by the people's democratic regime, which followed the "armed insurrection." But, *Lupta de Clasa* continues in the new united front spirit, "a role of immense importance for the establishment of workers leadership... was played by the Common Workers Front set up by the Romanian Communist Party and the Social Democratic Party on 1 May 1944," for it was the pivot of the "concentration of democratic forces" which won the victory of 6 March 1945.

No special tribute is paid by *Lupta de Clasa* on this occasion to Red Army participation in the victorious "concentration of democratic forces." However, it specifically mentions the participation of a part of the bourgeoisie in the "broad democratic front" which subsequently carried out the program of far-reaching democratic reforms drawn up by the Communist and Social Democratic parties. For, the editorial continues, after 6 March 1945 the party used the parliamentary method to establish the conditions needed to pass on to the socialist revolution. For the first time, *Lupta de Clasa* claims, universal suffrage in Romania became an actual fact and spelled the final defeat of the bourgeois-landlord parties at the November 1946 elections, in which the overwhelming majority of the people voted for people's democracy.

The fruitful collaboration of the Communist and Social Democratic parties was then sealed, writes *Lupta de Clasa*, by the fusion of the former with the left, and by far the most numerous, wing of the Social Democratic Party, to form the PNR (Partidul Muncitoresc Român, Romanian Workers Party).

The next section of the editorial is devoted to a review of the more important problems which had to be solved by the PNR in the years that followed. The solutions, representing a synthesis of the party's collective experience, constitute, in the editorial's opinion, an illustration of creative application of Leninist principles to the specific conditions obtaining in Romania.

STAT

The concluding pages of the editorial contain an enumeration of the many benefits conferred upon the people of Rumania by the Communist regime. Readers are assured that leadership of the country by the firm hand of the party guarantees every success, including, it is implied, a substantial improvement in material and cultural standards to be attained by raising labor productivity, reducing costs, and saving raw materials. *Lupta de Clasa* does not miss the opportunity to rebuke the familiar duties of party members for the successful achievement of these results.

The Party Statutes

In an article by P. Radovan (pages 16-28), *Lupta de Clasa* sets out to demonstrate that the new party statutes adopted by the Second PMR Congress are the embodiment of Leninist norms of party life, the essential one being internal party democracy.

The chief interest of the article lies in its very clear revelation of the embarrassment of a Rumanian Communist having to deal with the subject. On the one hand, he must duly castigate bossism in Rumania at the intermediate and lower party levels but, on the other hand, he must never imply that this aberration might have been rampant at the highest levels. Furthermore, he is faced with the problem of drawing the fine dividing line between reprehensible bossism and desirable leadership, and of not just wording the party statutes well, but of preventing their violation. Finally, he must refrain from explaining why the PMR claims on the one hand that it had never swerved from the straight and narrow path of Leninism (so proved by the proceedings of the 1953 Central Committee Plenum and the 1955 Party Congress), but found it necessary on the other hand to call another Plenum meeting in March 1956 (after the 20th Congress of the CPSU), which was followed by regime, rayon, and local party committee meetings, in order to "draw very valuable conclusions in connection with the gigantic importance of respecting the Leninist norms of party life."

Under the circumstances, it is hardly surprising to find that the proceedings of the 20th Congress are rendered as follows by Radovan: "[The Congress] stressed I. V. Stalin's meritorious work for the party, the workers of the USSR, and the international workers movement, and his remarkable role in the defense by the party of Lenin's ideological heritage, but [it] resolutely condemned the cult of Stalin's personality, which did considerable harm to party work. Marxism-Leninism combats the idealistic exaggeration of the role of personality, for it proclaims the decisive role of the popular masses; but the small-bourgeois and anarchical concepts, which deny the role of working class leaders as organizers of the masses, are foreign to Marxism-Leninism."

These lines are obviously Radovan's highly selective condensation of an editorial in the Soviet publication *Partiynaya Zhizn'* (Party Life), a Rumanian translation of which is published in the same issue of *Lupta de Clasa*.

Obliged to steer a tortuous course between the pitfalls mentioned above, Radovan's article defies summarization. The gist of the article is the claim that the PMR had, if not always, at least since 1951, consistently and correctly interpreted Lenin's ideas on collective leadership, although in practice they might not always have been respected at the lower levels. To prove the PMR's orthodoxy, Radovan mentions a number of articles of the new party statutes, approved by the December 1955 PMR Congress for the purpose of reinforcing the collective leadership principle. He lists articles prescribing the election of local committees and of their bureaus; the obligation to call plenary meetings at regular, but somewhat longer intervals than heretofore, to give more time for intelligent participation; the requirement that even committee bureaus and secretariats should take decisions by majority vote; the right and duty of all party members to express an opinion, etc. However, this last right is sharply

STAT

qualified by Radovan's warning that it "does not include a license to oppose the party line or to air anti-Marxist-Leninist views. Party organizations cannot tolerate small-bourgeois or anarchic manifestations, or manifestations that are not imbued with the party spirit or which betray negativism, skepticism, liberalism, or a blasé attitude, for they harm party unity and the application of the party line."

With respect to criticism and self-criticism, Radovan stresses the innovation introduced into the new statutes, which makes it the duty, not only the right, of party members to bring instances of poor work to the notice of party organs. But, Radovan warns, the party cannot tolerate that the right of criticism, which is intended to strengthen the party, be abused to combat its policy or to weaken it. A clear distinction must be made between constructive and destructive criticism.

Industrial Production

Specialization of production, and cooperation between plants in the machine building industry are discussed by J. Baschir and H. D. Starian (pages 29-39).

The authors agree that one of the most important preconditions for the fulfillment of the Second Five-Year Plan by the machine building industry, which is to increase its output 80-100 percent, is a speeding-up of the specialization and cooperation campaign.

The authors give a number of examples from Rumanian industrial enterprises to show the many advantages achieved by a plant when it specializes in the building of a small number of machines, or even of parts of machines. But the authors concede that in a country like Rumania the process cannot be carried too far, for a time at any rate. They emphasize that increased specialization obviously requires good cooperation between the various plants producing the parts to be assembled and that this demands in a socialist economy efficient planning at the center and scrupulous, unselfish respect of contracts between plant managements. Only thus can the uneconomic tendency of many plant managers to achieve utmost self-efficiency be counteracted.

The benefits of specialization, the authors conclude, will be even more widely felt when it is applied on an international scale by the members of the socialist camp.

The Cult of Personality

This issue of *Lupta de Clasa* contains a translation (pages 40-53) of the editorial, "The Damage of the Cult of Personality," from issue No 6 of the Soviet periodical *Partynaya Zhizn* (Party Life).

From "Party Work-Practice"

Under this heading, I. Cotot, first secretary of the Rumanian Regime PNR Committee, describes (pages 54-64) the method used by the committee, sprung into action by the leading administered by the Second Party Congress, to increase the output of the Rumanian Steel Combine and the Jiu Valley coal field.

Broadly speaking the method appears to have consisted mainly in the organization of two collectives of activists to study the situation on the spot and report to the committee. Armed with their findings and recommendations, the regime committee was in a better position to guide the raion committees in their remedial steps, which consisted in prodding base organizations, trade unions, and management to correct their well-known shortcomings, such as failure

STAT

to use machinery anywhere near capacity, poor maintenance, inadequate training of miners in the Jiu Valley, and backward techniques used at Hunedoara. The most striking success achieved, for the time being at any rate, appears to have been the transfer of 3,000 "auxiliary" workers to underground "productive" jobs in the coal mines.

In another article (pages 55-73), V. Daju, secretary of the Constanta Region PNM Comm. describes the successful work of a number of union territorial instructors. They are responsible to a great extent for the leading position of Constanta Region in agricultural collectivization. Daju cites a number of cases in which the instructors, who started their drive by trying to pinpoint the causes of the backwardness of some of the existing collective farms, found the members of these farms very critical of the councils and officers who ran the farms, and the Communists among them equally so of their base organizations. Daju fails to explain why, if that was the case, and the positions are indeed elective, the members had not simply used their voters' right to turn them out.

Party News

Under this heading, *Lupta de Clasa* features (page 75) the punishment meted out to a union party committee first secretary for incompetence and serious violations of Leninist principles of party democracy, culminating in an attempt to have a party member dismissed from his job for having reported his offenses to the higher party authorities.

Book Review

Under the title, (pages 76-84) "To Help Students of Economic Problems," Gr. Botoi and L. Malinte review a Romanian translation of a collection of Lenin's speeches and articles dealing with labor productivity.

Lessons and Consultations

The theme of *Lupta de Clasa*'s May lesson is "The Leninist Theory of Socialist Revolution and Its Creative Application to Romanian Conditions," given by I. Radulescu (pages 85-100). The lesson is little more than a restatement of Lenin's views on the socialist revolution and of developments in Rumania. The description of the latter is practically identical with the description given in this issue's editorial, with emphasis on the "parliamentary methods" employed to effect the transition from the "democratic to the socialist stage of the revolution." This transition, the article says, represents a "creative" application of Lenin's theories, under the different conditions obtaining in Rumania. With regard to the "democratic stage," Radulescu merely claims that, although there was some fighting and loss of life, it was, generally speaking, achieved without civil war, "the reactionary forces not being in a position to start one...." Why they were not in a position to do so is not stated, but emerges clearly from the following sentence, which says that "the victory of the popular insurrection, combined with the liberating mission of the Soviet Army, gave the coup de grace to the positions occupied by the exploiting class."

Radulescu draws the conclusion that the history of Rumania is another proof of Lenin's uncanny foresight when he evolved the "different-roads-to-socialism" theory.

Answers to Readers

This section answers a question on the proper drawing-up of work plans of base organizations (pages 107-111), and a question on the organization and duties of party groups in elected government organs and mass organizations (pages 112-115).

STAT

Notes

Under this heading, *Lupta de Clasa* explains (pages 123-124) the aims and methods of "concrete economy circles," a movement launched in Stalin Regime for the purpose of improving the economic knowledge of enterprise cadres.

June IssueEditorial

The subject of the editorial (pages 3-12) in the June 1956 issue of *Lupta de Clasa* is the beneficial effect of the 20th Congress of the CPSU on party activities in Rumania.

The theses adopted by the congress, the editorial claims, are a brilliant model of courageous and creative development of Marxist-Leninist science, and provide the solution of the most vital problems of our times. At the same time, they are a priceless source of guidance for the practical activity of Communist and workers parties. The report of the PMR delegation to the 20th Congress was amply discussed, the editorial continues, by the PMR Central Committee, by the activists of the regions, rayon, and city committees, and by state organs and mass organizations, and are at present being discussed by base organizations and are being studied throughout the network of party schools together with the decisions of the Second Congress of the PMR.

The discussions of the theses of the 20th Congress of the CPSU have provided, the editorial states, a welcome opportunity for the PMR cadres to analyze their own activities in applying the decisions of the Second PMR Congress, and are contributing powerfully to raising the ideological and organizational level of the party. Of particular importance were the light shed on the new relationship between the forces of peace and the forces of war, and on the significance of the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence; and the really profound and courageous, truly Marxist-Leninist, manner in which the 20th Congress posed the problem of the struggle against the cult of personality. The solution of this problem provides the basis on which PMR members are fighting this cult's consequences in Rumania.

The effects of the cult of Stalin's personality in Rumania were well brought out, *Lupta de Clasa* writes, by the Plenum of the Central Committee of the PMR of March 1956. The deviationists unmasked in 1952 were held greatly responsible for its spread in Rumania. Their eviction from the party had been of great importance for the re-establishment of the principle of collective leadership. As far back as 1952, the editorial states, the Central Committee "adopted a course toward elimination of the practice of glorifying party leaders," which had taken root in propaganda and press mediums, but as the criticism was "of internal character" the results were inadequate.

However, *Lupta de Clasa* continues, the subject was again taken up by the August 1953 Plenum of the Central Committee of the PMR, and this time the entire party membership was firmly enjoined to do away with the cult of personality, to respect the collective leadership principle; to strengthen the spirit of criticism and self-criticism, and to apply the party statutes. As a result, the practices of holding regular base organization meetings, of discussing activity reports, of electing party officials, and of frequently convening the party active spread continuously. The Second Party Congress, the editorial writes, could point to great successes in the building of socialism, but criticized a number of shortcomings in the economic and ideological fields, and provided the party with a powerful corrective instrument in the shape of a new

STAT

party statute. This party statute's superiority over its predecessor lies mainly in the fact that it reflects Leninist principles of party activities more consistently.

"But suppose the decision of our Second Party Congress had been," Lupta de Class boasts, "can be seen with greater clarity in the light of the teachings of the 20th Party Congress," with their strong accent on "the decisive role of popular masses in history and the party's role of leader of these masses."

The masses' spirit of initiative can only be stimulated, their experiences utilized, and the competence of party cadres put to account, the editorial goes on, if decisions reflect the point of view of the majority of the collective.

However, collective leadership is not an end, it says, but a means to the end of finding the best methods to carry out party and government decisions. This means that all essential problems must be studied before meetings by committee members, and the execution of decisions checked by them. Party members must also practice discipline and unity of action, and must be imbued with a deep sense of responsibility, in order to be able to lead the masses successfully on the road to socialism.

The editorial then proceeds to give concrete examples of violations of internal democracy. It cites, for example, the case in which an unpopular secretary was forced on a base organization by the rayon committee, cases in which criticisms were suppressed, cases in which leaders kept aloof from the rank and file, etc.

Of great importance for the strengthening of the party's ties with the masses, says the editorial, are tighter control of the state organs by the party, more socialist democracy, and stricter "people's legality." The two last problems had already preoccupied the 1953 Plenum of the Central Committee, the editorial claims, and although some progress had been made in the meantime, the Second Party Congress demanded that party and state organizations correct the serious abuses still prevalent in those fields. Spurred on by the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the PWR has intensified its drive to achieve a decisive improvement in the respect for people's legality.

On party initiative, the Grand National Assembly adopted in its last session a law amending the Code of Penal Procedure with the aim of protecting citizens against unjust prosecution, of ensuring that "in case of investigations, the truth be established under strict observance of people's legality," and of ensuring respect for constitutional provisions with regard to personal freedom, inviolability of the home and of correspondence, etc.

In the opinion of Lupta de Class, the debates in party aktiv meetings revealed the "strong unity and cohesion of the party members.... The thousands of speakers who showed up failings and negative phenomena were actuated by deep solicitude for strict observance of the party's policy and reinforcement of the party's leadership role...." That was the spirit in which, according to the editorial, the members of the Bucharest I. V. Stalin Raion party aktiv "deservedly rebuffed Alexander Jar and his slanderous outburst against the party and its political line. Abusing internal party democracy, he actually tried to deny the leadership role of the party in cultural work and the great achievements of our literature under its guidance, and to advocate a liberal attitude toward bourgeois ideology...." an attitude which led to his expulsion from the party.

The party members, the editorial explains, have the perfect right to discuss party problems and to criticize failings, with a view to correcting them and strengthening the party. But they have no right to propagate antiparty

STAT

of internal party democracy to discipline and unity is the prescription supplied by the editorial for the solution of the problem.

Another danger against which good Communists must always be on guard, the editorial warns, is formalism, that is, confusing substance and form. Concrete problems are not solved by generalities, or by careful avoidance by agitators of "theory" problems. If a Communist is to be a real leader of the masses, as he should, *Lupta de Clasa* continues, he must be well educated politically and ideologically. Although great progress has been made in party ideological work, it this work, while carefully shunning dogmatism, Rumanian Communists must derive great encouragement from the lessons of the 20th Congress to develop a lively creative activity, especially in the social and economic fields. They must study the specifically in the social and economic fields. They must study the specifically Rumanian problems, and, starting from Marxist-Leninist premises, "draw their scientific generalizations, and put them at the service of guiding the practical activities of the [Rumanian] people."

At the same time, however, *Lupta de Clasa* utters a stern warning against misguided elements who equate "peaceful coexistence" with peace between classes and a pause in the ideological struggle; or with the achievement of socialism without civil war, with "reformism." The socialist camp cannot for one moment relax its struggle "to unmask the reactionary character of a system based on subjection and exploitation." Among other mistakes to be avoided, the editorial lists uncritical admiration for bourgeois science and culture, which is something very different from the recommended utilization of real bourgeois achievements. In balance, the editorial asserts, the superiority of Marxist-Leninist science is incontrovertible, the best proof of this being the victory of the young Soviet science of physics over capitalist physics in the newest field of nuclear physics.

The struggle against mysticism, complains the editorial, has also been allowed to lag, in disregard of the injunction to intensify the campaign, issued by the Second Party Congress. Again, the freedom of religion guaranteed by the Rumanian Constitution does not preclude an unflagging campaign against religious superstitions, provided it is conducted exclusively in the realm of scientific argument and of persuasion.

Another Communist weakness, the editorial states, is the failure of party organizations to heed the demand of the Second Party Congress to stimulate contributions from nonparty intellectuals to the building of socialism. The first secretary of the Bucharest I. V. Stalin Raion PWR Committee had to confess recently that he had paid little attention to the matter, although the raion comprises the majority of the capital's intellectual institutions. Many party and state organs, the editorial complains, do not take any interest even in the proper ideological equipment and the activities of the members of the teaching profession, although their influence affects millions of children, virtually the entire coming generation. The party insists that the subordinate organs rectify this mistake, writes *Lupta de Clasa*, and conduct a persevering campaign among intellectuals, with due regard for the varied milieus in which they live and work.

The editorial ends with a warning that the measures to be taken as a result of the debates on the theses of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, in order to raise the level of party work considerably, must not be treated as a campaign; rather must they form a stage in the never-ending process of strengthening the party for the better performance of its role of leader of the people toward a happy and peaceful life.

STAT

Scientific Work

An article by Academician St. Milea is entitled "The Tasks of Scientists in Support of Production During the Second Five-Year Plan" (pages 13-26).

History of Communism in Rumania

The article, "Some Aspects of the Struggle for the Victory of Marxist-Leninist Ideology in the Rumanian Workers Movement" (pages 27-40), is an attempt by N. Petrovici and I. Eren to retraced the history of the internal struggles within the Rumanian socialist movement from 1918 to 1947.

The editors of *Lupta de Clasa* appear to have some doubts as to the correctness of the authors' views, for the article carries a footnote requesting specialists in this field to contribute their own opinions on the subject.

Literary Criticism

In the article, "Essential Features of the Modern Hero" (pages 51-57), the literary critic, S. Iosifescu, develops the theory that the heroes of contemporary (Communist) novels must be romantic, if they are to capture the readers' interest and sympathy. Only romantic heroes can be lifelike, the author argues, for they incarnate the "revolutionary romanticism" of the "present-day socialist transformations of unprecedented magnitude."

However, the critic warns, writers must be careful to differentiate between outgrown 19th century romanticism and the up-to-date variety: "Whereas isolation and inadaptability to life were characteristics of the old-fashioned romantic hero, his modern counterpart, a soldier in an army fired by the grandiose dream of Communism, cannot be otherwise than imbued with unquenchable optimism and indissoluble comradeship."

Agriculture in the US

In his article (pages 58-73) on agricultural practices in the US, Cr. Obrejaanu, a member of the Rumanian delegation of agriculturists who visited the US in 1955, tells what he learned about American agriculture on this trip.

Most of the article consists of what appears to be a fairly accurate account of conditions in the areas visited by the author and of a number of facts and figures that were supplied to him. He implicitly concedes the high level of technical proficiency achieved by the American farmer, especially in the fields of mechanization, fertilizers, herbicides, corn hybridization, and livestock raising, but predicts the imminent disappearance of the small farmer, who very soon will be completely ruined and forced to sell out to the large landowners. In Rumania, too, the future belongs to large-scale farming, but there, Obrejaanu claims, far from being ruined, the small farmer's standard of living will rise as a result of technical progress.

Party Life

In the first of two articles in this section, I. Verdet elaborates (pages 74-85) on the theme of internal party democracy.

According to Verdet, the beginning of the drive to strengthen this Leninist feature in Rumania goes back to 1951, when election of party organs by secret vote, the holding of the statutory party meetings, etc., started to become an increasingly regular practice. The experience gathered during the last years was embodied by the Second Party Congress in the amended party statute, which introduced a number of useful provisions along these lines. However, the

STAT

effects of these amendments seem to have been disappointing, for Verdet goes on to state that the Plenum of the Central Committee of the PNR, meeting in March 1956 to digest the lessons of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, drew valuable conclusions out of its discussions, and stressed its own obligation to respect "strictly" the statutory provisions with regard to the frequency of party congresses and central committee plenums, as well as the obligation of regime and rayon committees to abide "firmly" by the Leninist party norms.

The intensified efforts of the party organs to apply the decisions of the Second Party Congress of the PNR and of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, the author claims, began to bear fruit during recent months. Now party democracy as well as party life are said to be developing vigorously. They are at present, Verdet states, of capital importance, for maximum efficiency of party work is an indispensable condition for the fulfillment of the party's huge tasks.

The author then recapitulates the chief characteristics of party democracy, among which are the election of members of party organs by secret vote after public discussion of their qualifications, and their obligation to account periodically for their stewardship. Verdet admits that the rule that all party organs must be elected is not always respected. Members are being coopted instead of elected, although by-elections can always be held to fill vacancies in base organizations and sufficient alternate members are always available to replace full members of regime and rayon committees. Another reprehensible practice resorted to by some rayon committees is rigging the election of members of the bureau.

With regard to the obligation of party committees to account for their stewardship, Verdet points out that many enterprises and other base organization committees have failed even to call a general assembly during the last 12 months. He adds that the Central Committee of the PNR has recently drawn up new instructions with regard to the election of party organs and has decreed the holding of new elections in August, September, and October 1956.

The purpose of party democracy, the author recalls, is maximum "activation" of the Communist members, that is to encourage them to take an active part in discussing all party problems and to collaborate in the execution of decisions reached by majority vote. However, freedom to discuss all party problems must not be confused with freedom for disguised enemies of the party to undermine Marxist-Leninist principles by slanderous attacks. Other characteristics of party democracy named by Verdet are the right to criticize other party members, regardless of party meetings, the severe disciplining of those who punish or persecute critics, the right of an accused member to be heard before he can be expelled from the party, election of the presiding officers of base organization meetings, and so forth.

Party democracy and collective leadership, the author continues, are inseparable, for leadership by one man would negate the right of members to select their leaders. The Central Committee of the PNR, Verdet states, had consistently fought the growth of the tendency to undermine collective leadership, beginning with the elimination of the right-wing deviationists in 1952, and is now engaged in an all-out effort to cleanse the party of every vestige of the cult of personality. One of the most effective ways of ensuring collective leadership, the author continues, is to hold plenary meetings and meetings of the party actively; for experience teaches that where all important problems are thoroughly debated, decisions are taken collectively, and committee members are in the van when it comes to carrying them out. Economic and political progress is then greatest. However, Verdet explains, collective leadership does not absolve individual committee members of personal responsibility for action in the fields assigned to them.

STAT

The second article (pages 66-69) in the Party Life section is an unsigned account of a round-table conference of workers in the newspaper, radio, publishing, sociological research, and propaganda fields, which was organized in Bucharest by the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the PCR to discuss the decisions of the recent Rumanian and Soviet party congresses insofar as work in these fields was affected by them. The date of the meeting is not given.

According to the *Lupta de Clasa* account, the participants were in agreement that Marxist-Leninist teaching had made remarkable progress among party and nonparty members during the last few years, and that the ideological level of the party cadre had also risen. Many speakers extolled the successes achieved by the party among intellectuals. Indeed, the account claims, it had succeeded by dint of tact and hard ideological work in winning over the most valuable scientific, artistic, and technical elements. However, sociological scientific activity had suffered from the effects of the Stalin personality cult, which had led to dogmatism and parroting of "authorities," mainly Stalin, or else to flight into abstract speculations without practical value.

I. Ceterchi pointed out in his address to the conference, the article says, that the thesis according to which Stalin had always said the last word on the theory of the state and of law inevitably discouraged any original research on these subjects, while in natural sciences, such as biology and pedology, theories were applied uncritically to Rumanian conditions. The Ministry of Education was criticized by other speakers for neglecting to take into account the specific character of Rumanian teaching requirements and taking over mechanically the curriculum of Soviet social science chairs; also for the manner in which scientific advisers of candidates for doctor's degrees in social sciences performed their duties.

Press propaganda, says *Lupta de Clasa*, also came in for considerable criticism at the conference. Many articles were nothing more than dry paraphrases of theses and decisions. The press should be more combative and interesting, and could learn a great deal from the democratic and Communist traditions of the Rumanian press of yore.

On the other hand, a number of economists pointed out that scientific research was greatly hampered by the secretiveness of the Central Statistical Directorate, the State Planning Committee, and the Ministry of Finance, and that a more lively exchange of information with specialized institutes in other People's Democracies was also needed.

The meeting brought out, the article states, how necessary are ample discussions, the free interchange of opinions, and the clash of ideas -- on the platform of Marxist-Leninist ideology -- for developing creative scientific thought and solving problems. Speakers underlined the need to organize systematically creative debates in all fields of science, especially in the social sciences, on various problems that had been inadequately studied but were of great practical and theoretical urgency. They also emphasized the need for discussion columns in scientific periodicals. Many speakers drew attention to the need for ideological vigilance against bourgeois ideology, inasmuch as it was to be expected that reactionary elements would take advantage of conflicts of opinions for "non-scientific" (i.e., political) purposes; they further warned against nationalism and cosmopolitanism and underestimation of scientific achievements in the USSR and in People's Democracies.

Lupta de Clasa then proceeds to draw some general conclusions from the proceedings. In the first place, the periodical calls upon historians and philosophers to study "creatively" the revolutionary developments in Rumania since the 1931 Congress of the Rumanian Communist Party, in the light of the theses of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, which provide a clearer insight into the essence

STAT

of social phenomena in Rumania. *Lupta de Clasa* draws special attention to the problem of the class struggle during the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, a problem in which great confusion was sown by Stalin's dictum that the class struggle increased in sharpness as socialism progressed. Instead of spending their time looking for "proofs" of its applicability in Rumania, propagandists culture is also a fruitful field for improved propagandistic activity. *Lupta de Clasa* continues, for although in some regimes, such as Constanta, Galati, and Bucharest, socialisation had made remarkable progress, in Stalin Regime, the Rumanian Autonomous Regime, and others, progress is very slow.

Lupta de Clasa then reverts to the deficiencies of Rumanian historians, who consistently avoid contemporary history or, when they do write about it, think they are helping the party by embellishing the facts. The article also invites the Institute of Economic Research of the Rumanian Academy to help more effectively in the solution of economic problems; it chides the Institute of Philosophy for neglecting problems of historical and dialectical materialism and for lack of energy in fighting manifestations of idealism in Rumanian sciences; and it blames some chairs of social science for their neglect of practical problems, and others for their barrenness in the matter of scientific works.

Lupta de Clasa agrees that researchers, especially economists, have been hampered by the difficulty of obtaining statistical data, but believes that this difficulty has been removed to a great extent by the reorganization of the Institute of Economic Research of the Rumanian Academy. On the other hand, the periodical accuses many researchers of sitting back and waiting for the plums to drop into their laps, instead of collecting facts in the field themselves, discussing matters with party leaders, government officials, engineers, workers, and farmers; and, incidentally, helping them solve some of their problems by studying them scientifically.

The article ends with the usual exhortation to all concerned to take the lessons of the recent congresses and plenums to heart, and to pay more attention to the explanation of the respective roles in history of the masses and of personalities, such as Lenin. In this connection, the article recommends following Lenin's injunction to party propagandists to discuss economic problems concretely. To this end, *Lupta de Clasa* points to the need for greater differentiation in party education, especially in the night classes, according to the intellectual level and the different trades of the trainees. It also recommends recruiting propagandists among engineers, one of the urgent needs being to spread technical know-how among the population.

Party Information

Under this heading, *Lupta de Clasa* gives examples of successful methods used by party organizations to increase labor productivity in a number of industrial enterprises (pages 95-96).

Answers to Readers

Questions answered in this issue are:

How did the 20th Congress of the CPSU solve the problem of the prevention of war at the present time? (pages 96-106)

What must a recommendation of a candidate for party membership contain? (pages 106-109)

How must the dues of party members without fixed income be assessed? (pages 109-111)

STAT

From the Communist and Workers Press

This section (pages 118-119) gives excerpts from Kim Il-sung's report to the Third Congress of the Korean Workers' Party.

Reviews and Bibliography

This section (pages 120-121) contains a review of *Les Origines de la Religion* (The Origins of Religion) by the French Communist, Gh. Hainchein, recently translated into Romanian.

Notes

This section (pages 122-127) contains a sharp criticism of the periodical *Studii si Cercetari de Istorie Literara si Folclor* (Studies and Research in Literary History and Folklore) issued by the Institute of the same name of the Romanian Academy. Only three issues of this publication have appeared since 1952. The periodical, as well as the institute itself, is said to have fulfilled its task of "re-evaluating" older Romanian authors very inadequately.

...

3-5-57